



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

10 APR 2008

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

LIU & LIU
444 S. FLOWER STREET, SUITE 1750
LOS ANGELES CA 90071

In re Application of:	:	
SUMI, Naoki	:	
U.S. Application No.: 10/540,384	:	DECISION ON RENEWED
Int'l Application No: PCT/JP2003/016652	:	PETITION
Int'l Filing Date: 24 December 2003	:	(37 CFR 1.137(b))
Priority Date: 27 December 2002	:	
Atty Docket No.: JP02 0029 US	:	
For: METHOD FOR MANUFACTURING	:	
ELECTRONIC DEVICE AND	:	
ELECTRONIC DEVICE	:	

This decision is issued in response to applicant's "Renewed Petition Under 37 CFR 1.137(b) And Further Statement Of Unintentional Delay" filed 28 January 2008. No additional petition fee is required.

BACKGROUND

The procedural background for the present application was set forth in the previous Decision mailed herein on 02 January 2008. That decision dismissed applicant's original petition for revival based on the failure to satisfy all the requirements of a grantable petition. Specifically, applicant had failed to provide the complete "required reply" (i.e., an English translation of all the drawings), and applicant had not provided an acceptable showing that the entire delay was unintentional.

On 28 January 2008, applicant filed the "Renewed Petition Under 37 CFR 1.137(b) And Further Statement Of Unintentional Delay."

DISCUSSION

The renewed petition includes an English translation of Figure 82. This submission completes the "required reply," satisfying this element of a grantable petition.

The renewed petition also includes a further explanation regarding the delay that resulted in the abandonment herein. In this statement, petitioner confirms that the attorney signing the petition was in position to have firsthand knowledge of the facts and circumstances of the delay at issue in that such attorney was responsible for the present application at the time of abandonment. Petitioner goes on to again assert that the "entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the required reply until the filing of a grantable petition under 37 CFR

1.137(b) was unintentional.” Based on the further explanation provided in the renewed petition, petitioner’s statements herein are accepted as satisfying the requirements of 37 CFR 1.137(b)(3).

Based on the above, applicant has now satisfied all the requirements for a grantable petition for revival under 37 CFR 1.137(b).

CONCLUSION

Applicants’ petition for revival under 37 CFR 1.137(b) is **GRANTED**.

This application is being referred to the National Stage Processing Division of the Office of PCT Operations for further processing in accordance with this decision. The date under 35 U.S.C. 371(c)(1), (c)(2), and (c)(4) is 28 January 2008.



Richard M. Ross
Attorney Advisor
Office of PCT Legal Administration
Telephone: (571) 272-3296
Facsimile: (571) 273-0459